

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trad mark Offic Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SUMIYA H 53674-015 **EXAMINER** IM22/0606 MACDERMOTT WILL & EMERY 600 13TH STREET NW GROUP, K WASHINGTON DC 20005-3096 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1755 DATE MAILED: 06/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/462,876

Applicant(s)

Sumiya et al

Examiner

Karl Group

Art Unit 1755

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
A SH	for Reply ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
af	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed ation. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
be - If NO	considered timely.	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
- Failur - Any i	e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). a mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status		
1) X	Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 14, 2	2001
2a) 💢	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This act	tion is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	objected to by the Examiner.
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	
13)□	under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p All b) Some* c) None of:	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received in Application No
	application from the International Bure	
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
	-	• • •
Attachm		10) The base in Commence (DTO 412) Procedure
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:
		•

Application/Control Number: 09/462876

Art Unit: 1755

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a, b or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Suzuki et al (5,691,260) and JP 09059068, each taken alone for reasons of record.

Applicants argument that the PTO has not identified any factual basis upon which to predicate the determinations that any sintered cubic boron nitride which happens to have a certain grain size necessarily exhibits the properties set forth in the claims is not persuasive in overcoming the rejections. The PTO does not have access to testing equipment such as x-ray diffraction to determine that the claimed properties are in fact not possessed by the prior art. It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

It is noted that Suzuki et al teach the purity of the boron composite is at least 99% and preferably 99.9%. The impurity includes any existing hexagonal phase (column 3, lines 11-35). Clearly the problems existing in the processes (JP 8-63-394) described on page 5 of the disclosure are not experienced in the process taught by Suzuki et al.

Application/Control Number: 09/462876

Art Unit: 1755

It is further argued the JP'068 document includes carbon and oxygen. This is not persuasive in overcoming the rejection because the claims do not exclude oxygen or carbon.

Applicants have not shown by way of tangible evidence that the prior art references have lower transverse rupture strengths.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki 3. et al, US 6,096,671 further in view of Suzuki et al '260, for reasons of record.

It is agreed that Kawasaki et al produce hexagonal boron nitride sintered bodies however the reference is relied upon for teaching applicants claimed method of producing hexagonal boron nitride powders is well known. Suzuki et al teach the process of forming cubic boron nitride composites from hexagonal boron nitride particles such as that taught by Kawasaki et al.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double 4. patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,071,841. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because for reasons of record.

No arguments have been made concerning the double patenting rejection.

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/462876

Art Unit: 1755

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date

of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl Group whose telephone number is (703)308-3821. The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Mark Bell, can be reached on (703)308-3823. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)305-3599.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

KARL GROUP PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 1755

Keg

June 6, 2001